Remarks

Claims 1-44 and 49 are pending in the present application and are rejected. No new claims are presented for examination in the present application. No claims are cancelled since the previous examination. Claims 1,18,33,40-42, 44, and 49 are amended in the present application.

Claims, 1, 18, 33, 40-42, 44, and 49 are amended to include the limitation "wherein at least one of the links is not pre-selected by the user". The disclosure for this limitation is provided on page 9, lines 6-14 and also on page 15, lines 1-27 of the Applicants' specification. Claims 1 and 40 are amended by inclusion of the limitation "viewing by a user". The disclosure for this limitation is provided on page 11, lines 6-8 of the Applicants' specification. Claims 1, 18, 40, 41, 42, 44, and 49 are amended by removal of the limitation "immediately". No new material is added by these amendments.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-32, 40-44 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Independent Claims 1, 18, 40, 41, 42, 44, and 49 are amended by removal of the limitation "immediately". Independent Claims 1, 40, and 49 are amended by inclusion of the limitation "viewing by a user via an application program". These amendments clarify an important feature of the invention, specifically that the links are delivered to the application program rather than the user and are available for subsequent viewing by the user.

Accordingly, amended independent Claims 1, 18, 40, 41, 42, 44, and 49, along with Claims 2-17 and 43 which depend upon said amended independent Claims, are allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4, 10, 12-14, 16-18, 21, 23-25, 30, 32, 40, 42 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Huang et al., USPN 6,571,245 B2 (hereafter referred to as Huang).

Independent Claims 1, 18, 40, 42, 44, and 49 are amended by inclusion of the limitation "at least one of the links is not pre-selected by the user". This limitation recites an important feature of the invention, specifically that one or more of the links in the list of links is not selected by a user and may instead be selected by a third-party, such as a web server. As disclosed by the present application, a web server may have a predefined or pre-build list of links for particular subject categories or user interests (Specification p. 9, ll. 13-14). The web server may then transfer the pre-constructed list of links to an appropriate location specified by the user or an application program (Specification p. 9, ll. 26-28).

In allowing one or more links to be selected by a third-party rather than the user, the present invention provides for a marketing system for vendors and a revenue stream for the third-party. By developing a list of links that are new from the perspective of the user, yet relevant to the user's interests, a third-party can provide marketing to vendors via a user clicking on the respective vendor's links; the third-party can then charge the vendor an appropriate advertisement fee.

For a rejection to be sustained under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), each element and limitation must be present in the prior art reference. Huang does not disclose that "at least one of the links is not pre-selected by the user". Instead, Huang discloses different and inconsistent behavior from the present invention, as exemplified by the following passage:

> The bookmarks in [the] database are uploaded to, and downloaded from, a virtual desktop at the designated times. This allows the user on the local PC to have access to **a familiar set of bookmarks** on the virtual desktop.

Huang, col. 12, ll. 64-67 (bolded in part to show emphasis)

Huang relates to providing a virtual desktop so a user can access the virtual desktop from different systems. As part of the virtual desktop, Huang discloses a bookmark synchronization feature as a means for allowing the user to access "a familiar set of bookmarks" from a different computer. Clearly, this is very different from receiving new and relevant bookmarks as disclosed in the present invention and discussed above.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, independent claims 1, 18, 40, 42, 44, and 49, along with their dependent claims, are allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Huang.

Claims 33-35 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Mullen-Schultz, USPN 6,393,462 B1 (hereafter referred to as Mullen-Schultz).

Independent Claims 33 and 41 are amended by inclusion of the limitation "at least one of the links is not pre-selected by the user". As previously discussed, this limitation confers the benefit of providing a user with new and relevant links, provides marketing for vendors, and provides a revenue stream for a third-party. Mullen-Schultz, like Huang, does not disclose that "at least one of the links is not pre-selected by the user". Rather, Mullen-Schultz discloses different and inconsistent behavior from the present invention. Mullen-Schultz refers to a "primary computer" and a "secondary computer" as exemplified by the following passage:

> ...the primary computer is the computer where the user's personalized bookmark information is stored, and the alternate computer is any computer which does not have the user's personalized bookmark information.

Mullen-Schultz, col. 8, ll. 51-54

Mullen-Schultz further discusses a "bookmark transfer mechanism" from the primary computer to the alternate computer as follows:

> Referring now to FIG. 4, the computer system of FIG. 3 is shown after bookmark transfer mechanism 123 has been executed. Alternate computer 314 **now includes a copy** of bookmark information 124 which has been transferred from primary computer 310.
>
> Mullen-Schultz, col. 8, ll. 38-44 (bolded in part to show emphasis)

As shown and described above, Mullen-Schultz does not include any disclosure discussing at least one or more links not pre-selected by a user. Rather, Mullen-Schultz discusses transferring a copy of bookmarks from one computer ("primary computer") to another computer ("alternate computer").

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, independent claims 33 and 41, along with their dependent claims, are allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Mullen-Schultz.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The application currently names joint inventors.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang in view of Cordell, USPN 6,031,989 (hereafter referred to as Cordell).

Claim 5 includes the added limitation "at least one of the links in not pre-selected by the user" of amended independent Claim 1. As noted above, the Huang reference does not disclose all of the claimed limitations. Combining the Cordell reference with the Huang reference still fails to suggest all of the elements recited in the Applicants' claims. The Examiner only relies on Cordell to illustrate an operating system toolbar; however, as noted above, there are additional significant shortcomings in Huang that are not overcome by Cordell. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Claim 5 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Huang in view of Cordell.

Claims 6-7, 22 and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang in view of Reese, USPN 6,374,237 B1 (hereafter referred to as Reese).

Claims 6-7 include the added limitation "at least one of the links in not pre-selected by the user" of amended independent Claim 1. Claims 22 and 26-28 include the same limitation of independent Claim 18. As noted above, the Huang reference does not disclose all of the claimed limitations. Combining the Reese reference with the Huang reference still fails to suggest all of the elements recited in the Applicants' claims. The Examiner only relies on Reese to illustrate the step of determining a profile of the user based on previously collected user information; however, as noted above, there are additional significant shortcomings in Huang that are not overcome by Reese. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Claims 6-7, 22, and 26-28 are allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Huang in view of Reese.

Claims 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang and Reese as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of Meade, II, USPN 6,405,214 B1 (hereafter referred to as Meade).

Claims 8-9 include the added limitation "at least one of the links in not pre-selected by the user" of amended independent Claim 1. As noted above, the Huang reference does not disclose all of the claimed limitations. Combining the Reese reference and the Meade reference with the Huang reference still fails to suggest all of the elements recited in the Applicants' claims. The Examiner only relies on Reese and Meade to illustrate the step of determining a profile of the user; however, as noted above, there are additional significant shortcomings in Huang that are not overcome by the combination of Reese and Meade. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Claims 8-9 are allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Huang in view of Reese and further in view of Meade.

Claims 11 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang in view of Mullen-Schultz.

Claim 11 includes the added limitation "at least one of the links in not pre-selected by the user" of amended independent Claim 1. Also, Claim 29 includes this same limitation of amended Claim 18. As noted above, neither the Huang reference nor the Mullen-Schultz reference discloses all of the claimed limitations. Combining the Mullen-Schultz reference with the Huang reference still fails to suggest all of the elements recited in the Applicants' claims. The Examiner only relies on Mullen-Schultz to illustrate at least one picture or graphic associated with at least one link; however, as noted above, there are additional significant shortcomings in both Huang and Mullen-Schultz that do not overcome all of the claimed limitations. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Claim 11 and 29 are allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Huang in view of Mullen-Schultz.

Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang in view of Blumer et al., US 6,189,019 B1 (hereafter referred to as Blumer).

Claim 31 includes the added limitation "at least one of the links in not pre-selected by the user" of amended independent Claim 18. As noted above, the Huang reference does not disclose all of the claimed limitations. Combining the Blumer reference with the Huang reference still fails to suggest all of the elements recited in the Applicants' claims. The Examiner only relies on Blumer to illustrate the step of transferring each link to a separate file on the user's computer system; however, as noted above, there are additional significant shortcomings in Huang that do not overcome all of the claimed limitations. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Claim 31 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Huang in view of Blumer.

Claims 15, 19-20 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang in view of Meade.

Claim 15 includes the added limitation "at least one of the links in not pre-selected by the user" of amended independent Claim 1. Claims 19-20 include the same limitation of amended independent Claim 18. Amended independent claim 44 also includes the same limitation. As noted above, the Huang reference does not disclose all of the claimed limitations. Combining the Meade reference with the Huang reference still fails to suggest all of the elements recited in the Applicants' claims. The Examiner only relies on Meade to for aspects of billing and accounting information; however, as noted above, there are additional significant shortcomings in Huang that do not overcome all of the claimed limitations. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Claim 15, 19-20, and 44 are allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Huang in view of Meade.

Claims 36-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mullen-Schultz in view of Blumer and further in view of Adams et al., USPN 6,334,145 B1 (hereafter referred to as Adams).

Claims 36-38 include the added limitation "at least one of the links in not pre-selected by the user" of amended independent Claim 33. As noted above, the Mullen-Schultz

reference does not disclose all of the claimed limitations. Combining the Blumer reference with the Mullen-Schultz reference still fails to suggest all of the elements recited in the Applicants' claims. The Examiner only relies on Blumer and Adams to teach the step of generating a list of links comprising creating a hierarchical list having link s grouped by subject categories; however, as noted above, there are additional significant shortcomings in Mullen-Schultz that do not overcome all of the claimed limitations. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Claim 36-38 are allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Mullen-Schultz in view of Meade in view of Blumer and further in view of Adams.

Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mullen-Schultz in view of Meade.

Claim 39 includes the added limitation "at least one of the links in not pre-selected by the user" of amended independent Claim 33. As noted above, the Mullen-Schultz reference does not disclose all of the claimed limitations. Combining the Meade reference with the Mullen-Schultz reference still fails to suggest all of the elements recited in the Applicants' claims. The Examiner only relies on Meade to illustrate forwarding billing information; however, as noted above, there are additional significant shortcomings in Mullen-Schultz that do not overcome all of the claimed limitations. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Claim 39 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Mullen-Schultz in view of Meade.

Claim 43 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang in view of Khan et al., USPN 6,460,038 B1 (hereafter referred to as Khan).

Claim 43 includes the added limitation "at least one of the links in not pre-selected by the user" of amended independent Claim 42. As noted above, the Huang reference does not disclose all of the claimed limitations. Combining the Khan reference with the Huang reference still fails to suggest all of the elements recited in the Applicants' claims. The Examiner only relies on Khan to show an accounting server; however, as noted above, there are additional significant shortcomings in Huang that do not overcome all of the claimed

limitations. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Claim 43 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Huang in view of Khan.

Conclusion

Applicants have made a genuine effort to respond to each of the Examiner's rejections in advancing the prosecution of this case. Applicants believe that all formal and substantive requirements for patentability have been met and that this case is in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. If a telephone or video conference would help expedite allowance or resolve any additional questions, such a conference is invited at the Examiner's convenience.

The fee for the two month extension of time in the amount of $230.00 is being filed electronically herewith. Please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments as a result of the filing of this paper to our Deposit Account No. 02-3978.

Respectfully submitted,

Gilbert Borman, et al.

By /James W. Proscia/
    James W. Proscia
    Reg. No. 47,010
    Attorney/Agent for Applicant

Date: October 4, 2007

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351